

**REMARKS**

**Formalities**

With this Amendment, Applicants amend Claims 1, 4, 5, and 7 and cancel Claim 6.

Therefore, Claims 1-5 and 7-17 are all the claims currently pending in the application.

With the current Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges Applicants' claim to foreign priority and the receipt of the certified copy of the priority document. The Examiner also returns a signed and initialed copy of the PTO-Form 1449 submitted with the May 26, 2004 IDS.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 4 and 5 stand objected to due to minor informalities. Applicants amend Claims 4 and 5, as shown, in order to correct these informalities. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments are not intended to narrow the scope of the original claims, but are rather for precision of language and to explicitly recite within the claim what was believed to have already been implicitly defined therein. Accordingly, these amendments do not foreclose application of reasonable equivalents.

**Claims 1-5 and 8-17**

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that Claims 4-6 and 13 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten into independent form including the limitations of the claims from which they depend.

Claims 1-3, 7, 12, 14, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Lambert, U.S. Patent No. 6,288,815 ("Lambert"), in view of Davis, U.S. Patent No. 6,813,087 ("Davis"). Claims 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

allegedly unpatentable over Lambert, in view of Davis and Ouchi et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0169376 (“Ouchi”). Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Lambert, in view of Davis and Bierhuizen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,839,095 (“Bierhuizen”).

With this Amendment, Applicants amend independent Claim 1 to include the limitations of Claim 6. Accordingly, Claim 6 is cancelled. Applicants note that the subject matter of Claim 2, from which Claim 6 previously depended has not been incorporated into Claim 1. In the current Office Action, the Examiner states that “Claim 6 has been found to be allowable because the prior art of record either alone or in combination neither discloses nor makes obvious the projection system comprising micromirrors that are diagonally driven according to image signals, in combination with the particular combination of features recited in Claim 1.” (Office Action, p. 7-8)

Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable and that Claims 2-5 and 8-17 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence on Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-3, 8-12, and 14-17 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claim 7**

With this Amendment, Applicants rewrite Claim 7 into independent form. Applicants note that the limitations of Claim 1, but not those of Claim 2, have been incorporated into the rewritten Claim 7. As discussed above, Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Lambert, in view of Davis.

Regarding Claim 7, Applicants note that neither Lambert nor Davis teaches or suggests at least a light valve comprising a plurality of micromirrors which are perpendicularly driven according to an image signal, as recited. Davis describes that the projection system of Figure 1 is a micromirror-based projection system. The Examiner relies on this description as teaching a light valve having micromirrors which are perpendicularly driven. (Office Action, p. 4). However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the micromirrors of Davis are driven perpendicularly, as claimed.

Therefore, in view of the above, Applicants submit that claim 7 is patentable over any reasonable combination of Lambert and Davis and respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 7 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**  
U.S. Application No. 10/811,144

**Q74907**

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura Moskowitz  
Registration No. 55,470

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 14, 2005